



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,175	02/20/2001	Shigeru Fujita	024304-00000	2341

7590 05/14/2004

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

H

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,175

Applicant(s)

FUJITA, SHIGERU

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2, 2/20/01.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. Figures 6 and 7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 3, line 11, "POS" needs to be spelled out before the use of an abbreviation can be used.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 11, the use of the term POS is not spelled out before the abbreviation is used. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2154

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moderi et al (hereinafter Moderi) U.S Patent No. 5,590,288 in view of Lum, U.S Patent No. 6,272,529.

7. As to claim 1, Moderi teaches a distributed processing system comprising a plurality of clients, wherein at least one of said clients is operable in standalone fashion and has server functionality so that it executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests (abstract, Figure 1, column 3, line 47 to column 4, line 21 and column 13, lines 34-44).

Moderi does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

8. Lum teaches that clients in a distributed processing system can be linked in series (column 2, lines 53-58 and column 5, lines 31-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Moderi's clients in series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

Art Unit: 2154

9. As to claim 3, Moderi teaches a plurality of clients, wherein at least one of said clients is operable in standalone fashion and has server functionality so that it executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests (abstract, Figure 1, column 3, line 47 to column 4, line 21 and column 13, lines 34-44).

Moderi does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

10. Lum teaches that clients can be linked in series (column 2, lines 53-58 and column 5, lines 31-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Moderi's clients in series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

11. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moderi and Lum as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in further view of Moderi et al (hereinafter Moderi[2]) U.S Patent No. 5,510,979.

12. As to claim 2, Moderi does not specifically teach a distributed processing system wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product,

Art Unit: 2154

designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration.

13. Moderi[2] teaches a distributed processing system wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration (column 13, lines 19-46 and column 15, line 19 to column 16, line 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Moderi[2]'s security and authentication functionality into Moderi's distributed processing system so that employee identification information can be stored in a central location but accessed from multiple terminals.

14. As to claim 4, Moderi does not specifically teach clients wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration.

15. Moderi[2] teaches clients wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration,

Art Unit: 2154

product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration (column 13, lines 19-46 and column 15, line 19 to column 16, line 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Moderi[2]'s security and authentication functionality into Moderi's clients so that employee identification information can be stored in a central client but accessed from multiple connected client.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (703)305-8864. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100